

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 and 18-20 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the remarks.

Claims 17-19 have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Referring to Claim 17-19; Claim 17 has been canceled. Claim 18 has been amended to depend from Claim 14. Claims 16 and 18 claim receiving a rule trigger from a location handler and a signal handler, respectively. Therefore, Claims 18 and 19 are believed to satisfy 37 CFR 1.75(c).

Reconsideration of the objections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 and 13-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Boyd (USPN 6,484,148). The Examiner stated essentially that Boyd teaches all the limitations of Claims 1-9 and 13-21.

Claims 1, 14, and 20 are the independent claims.

Referring to Claim 1; Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "displaying a first portion of the content according to a first rule of the two triggered rules; preventing the display of a second portion of the content according to a second rule of the two triggered rules." Boyd teaches a method for display advertisements according to identifying signals corresponding to consumer profiles (see col. 5, lines 9-14). Boyd does not teach "displaying a first portion of the content according to a first rule of the two triggered rules; preventing the display of a second portion of the content

according to a second rule of the two triggered rules” as claimed in Claim 1. Boyd teaches that individuals may remove their profiles from a profile database so that the device will not display targeted advertising (see col. 12, lines 46-56). Boyd’s system relies on the presence or absence of a customer’s profile in a database. The absence of the customer’s profile is required for preventing targeting advertising. The absence of the customer’s profile is clearly not analogous to the claimed “second rule” that prevents the display of content; Boyd fails to teach a profile that would prevent the display of content. Boyd fails to teach such a means for preventing display of content. Therefore, Boyd fails to teach all the limitations of Claim 1.

Referring to Claim 14; Claim 14 claims, *inter alia*, “displaying content according to each satisfied rule, wherein a first satisfied rule specifies that the radio frequency identification tag or the infrared tag be detected and a second satisfied rule specifies a certain demographic determined based on a product associated with the radio frequency identification tag or the infrared tag; and determining a monetary charge based on the content displayed and a value associated with the satisfied rules which triggered the display of the content, wherein different rules having different values.” Boyd teaches a method for display advertisements according to identifying signals corresponding to consumer profiles (see col. 5, lines 9-14). Boyd does not teach “determining a monetary charge based on the content displayed and a value associated with the satisfied rules which triggered the display of the content, wherein different rules having different values” as claimed in Claim 14. Boyd teaches that company subscribers pay to have their ads delivered to a targeted consumer (see col. 11, lines 52-56). Thus, Boyd pays the company subscribers according to a number of ads delivered. The number of ads delivered is not believed to be analogous to determining a monetary charge based on the content displayed and a

value of the satisfied rules which triggered the display of the content. For example, Boyd pays based only a number of ads displayed.

Referring to the Response to Argument, and point “b” in particular, Applicants point to the teachings of Boyd that specify “[t]he optimal ad may be determined by the advertising fees generated by displaying the advertisements and/or the strength of the match between the advertisement profile and the consumer profile(s)” (see col. 12, lines 45-51); that is Boyd links fees only with the ads. Boyd fails to teach a linking of fees with consumer profiles. Further, consider that Claim 14 recites first and second satisfied rules and a monetary charge based on value associated with the satisfied rules and the content displayed – three parameters. Boyd fails to teach such a fee structure; that is a monetary charge based on more than the mere display of an ad (a single parameter for the determination of a fee).

For at least the forgoing reasons, Boyd fails to teach all the limitations of Claim 14.

Referring to Claim 20; Claim 20 claims, *inter alia*, “determining the fee dynamically for each display of the content according to value of the device parameters currently satisfying the triggered rule.” Boyd teaches a method for display advertisements according to identifying signals corresponding to consumer profiles (see col. 5, lines 9-14). Boyd does not teach “determining the fee dynamically for each display of the content according to value of the device parameters currently satisfying the triggered rule” as claimed in Claim 20. Boyd associates fees with ads only (see col. 12, lines 45-51). Further, the fees of Boyd are static in that they are associated only with the ads; the fees of Boyd do not change for a given ad and therefore are not dynamic, essentially as claimed. Therefore, Boyd fails to teach all the limitations of Claim 20.

Claims 2-9 depend from Claim 1. Claims 15, 16, 18, and 19 depend from Claim 14. Claim 21 depends from Claim 20. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 1, 14, and 21. Claim 17 has been canceled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyd. The Examiner stated essentially that Boyd teaches or suggests all the limitations of Claims 10 and 11.

Claims 10-12 depend from Claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including Claims 1-16 and 18-20, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 13, 2008

/Nathaniel T. Wallace/
Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

Mailing Address:
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889